

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) is necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS).

The result was announced—yeas 59, nays 39, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 458 Ex.]

YEAS—59

Baldwin	Heinrich	Reed
Bennet	Hickenlooper	Romney
Blumenthal	Hirono	Rosen
Booker	Kaine	Sasse
Brown	Kelly	Schatz
Burr	King	Schumer
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Capito	Leahy	Sinema
Cardin	Lujan	Smith
Carper	Manchin	Stabenow
Casey	Markey	Tester
Collins	Menendez	Toomey
Coons	Merkley	Van Hollen
Cortez Masto	Murkowski	Warner
Duckworth	Murphy	Warnock
Durbin	Murray	Warren
Feinstein	Ossoff	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Padilla	Wicker
Hagerty	Peters	Wyden
Hassan	Portman	

NAYS—39

Barrasso	Fischer	McConnell
Blackburn	Graham	Moran
Blunt	Grassley	Paul
Boozman	Hawley	Risch
Braun	Hoeben	Rubio
Cassidy	Hyde-Smith	Scott (FL)
Cornyn	Inhofe	Scott (SC)
Cotton	Johnson	Shelby
Cramer	Kennedy	Sullivan
Crapo	Lankford	Thune
Cruz	Lee	Tillis
Daines	Lummis	Tuberville
Ernst	Marshall	Young

NOT VOTING—2

Rounds
Sanders

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKENLOOPER). Under the previous order, the motions to reconsider are considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's actions.

The Senator from Illinois.

ELECTION SECURITY

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, today is the 1-year anniversary of an election that was judged the most secure in the history of America. Let me say that again. The election that ended November 3, 2020, 1 year ago, was judged the most secure in American history. That is not my opinion; that is the official conclusion, under the Trump administration, of his Department of Homeland Security, which coordinates with the Nation's top cyber security and voting infrastructure experts to protect our elections. They released that assessment 10 days after last year's election, and they did it in the face of a dangerous and unprecedented avalanche of attacks and tweets from the enraged President Donald Trump, who claimed falsely that the election had been stolen from him.

Those election security experts were not alone. President Trump and his loyalists filed more than 50 lawsuits in

State and Federal courts, repeating their false claims of voter fraud and stolen votes—50. Every crackpot theory that Rudy Giuliani could glean or spawn on the internet was tested in court. How did they do? Fifty lawsuits. No evidence to back their claims in the courts; only bizarre conspiracy theories and far-right internet gossip, which they accepted as gospel. Well, the lawsuits were all dismissed, some even by judges President Trump had nominated. It was not a great day for the theory of a stolen election in the courts of America.

What happened next? What happened was documented by the Senate Judiciary Committee, which I chair. We brought witnesses before us to really explore stage 2 of President Trump's effort to overturn the last election.

When he couldn't win in the courts, he decided to go to the Department of Justice. William Barr, his honored, loyal Attorney General, resigned after announcing he could find nothing wrong with the election, and then President Trump took it in his own hands. With a few of his allies, one of them Jeffrey Clark in the Department of Justice, they tried to pressure the Acting Attorney General, Jeffrey Rosen, to send a letter out to the attorneys general and other State authorities across the Nation to tell them to suspend reporting the electoral college vote count.

Well, Jeffrey Rosen and others stood up to the President even when he threatened to dismiss him and replace him. In fact, when that happened, a number of people in the Department of Justice, many of whom were appointees by President Trump, said that they would resign en masse if that happened.

So the Trump approach to take this to the Department of Justice and to railroad his way through there failed, but the Big Lie continued. We all know about the death and destruction of the Big Lie in this Capitol Building, in this Senate Chamber, on January 6. In this Capitol Building, 5 people lost their lives, and over 100 law enforcement were attacked by the mob that descended on this building. The entire world looked on in disbelief to think that a President would send a mob up to overrun the Capitol and to stop the electoral college vote count.

The Big Lie is also corroding America's faith in our electoral system. A new poll released this week disclosed that only one in three Republican voters trusts that the 2024 elections will be fair—only one in three.

One year ago, Americans braved a lethal pandemic to cast their ballots. Many stood in line, some for hours. The 2020 general election saw the highest voter turnout in more than a century, according to the Brennan Center. And as I said, it was our most secure election ever, as judged by President Trump's Department of Homeland Security and his Attorney General, William Barr. We ought to be proud of that.

Sadly, however, instead of telling people the truth and defending our elections, lawmakers in many States are using the Big Lie, propagated by former President Trump, as a pretext to undermine America's right to vote. We need to use examples here so you understand what we are saying.

Remember the runoff election for two senatorial seats in the State of Georgia? It was an important election, and there were unprecedented numbers of voters participating in it. The law in Georgia at the time said that people could register to vote between the official election count on November 3 and the runoff election count in January. Then the Georgia Legislature, after two Democratic Senators were elected, changed that and said: No, you can't register to vote in that interim period of time. They reduced the amount of time that people would have to cast absentee ballots.

Since the January 6 assault on the Capitol, more than 425 bills have been introduced in 49 States to make it harder to vote and in some cases easier for some politicians to overturn elections if they don't like voters' choices.

This is exactly how democracies wither. If we undermine the most fundamental concept of democracy—the right to vote and the right for people in that electorate to choose its leaders—we are going to weaken this democracy that we were honored to inherit.

Three times this year on the floor of the U.S. Senate, Republican Senators have used the filibuster, which historically has been the favorite tool of segregationists—and I might add, many of those segregationists were Democrats—to prevent this Senate from even debating voting rights. Let me say that again. Republicans have used the filibuster to prevent the Senate from even debating both the For the People Act twice and the Freedom to Vote Act.

The other day, I looked up the cloture vote on another of our Nation's great laws, the Civil Rights Act of 1964. On June 10, 1964, Senators voted to end the longest filibuster in history and allowed the Civil Rights Act to move forward. The vote tally is important. Among Republican Senators, 27 voted for cloture to end the filibuster, and 6 voted not to, to support the continuation of the filibuster—27 to 6 on the Republican side. The vote by Democratic Senators, as history judges it, and I stand by that judgment, was less noble. Forty-four Democrats voted to end the filibuster on the Civil Rights Act, and 23 voted to sustain it.

So if the Republicans voted with such a strong majority in favor of ending the filibuster that was propagated by Democratic Senators at the time against the Civil Rights Act, what has happened since? What has become of this Republican Party, this party of Abraham Lincoln? In fact, what has become of the party of Ronald Reagan?

You see, 40 years ago this week, President Reagan proudly signed a bill

extending the full protections of the 1965 Voting Rights Act for 25 years. This is what Ronald Reagan, Republican President of the United States, said: "For this nation to remain true to its principles, we cannot allow any American's vote to be denied, diluted, or defiled. The right to vote," he said, "is the crown jewel of American liberties, and we will not see its luster diminished."

What a statement—as powerful and decisive as one might ask from a Republican President when he extended the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

So I want to commend my friend, and she is my friend, Senator LISA MURKOWSKI, the senior Senator from Alaska, for remaining true to the values of Abraham Lincoln and Ronald Reagan even in this hyperpartisan age.

Later today, the Senate will vote on whether to begin debate on the compromise version of the John Lewis Voting Rights Advancement Act. The compromise is the result of months of good-faith negotiation involving Senator LEAHY, the lead Democratic sponsor, my office, as well as Senator MANCHIN, Senator MURKOWSKI, and others who support this legislation. It will restore the original intention and protections of the 1965 Voting Rights Act, before misguided rulings by the Supreme Court gutted that magnificent law and rendered many of its critical protections vulnerable.

When a narrow conservative majority in the Supreme Court struck down the Voting Rights Act enforcement provision 8 years ago, it concluded that Congress could come up with a new enforcement formula for our times. Well, we did. This is it. The John R. Lewis Voting Rights Advancement Act contains that new formula. It is fair, it is bipartisan, and we need it urgently to stop the nationwide assault on voting rights that is being justified by President Trump's Big Lie.

Years ago, in one of the most memorable experiences in my public life, early on a foggy Sunday morning, I stood on the Edmund Pettus Bridge in Selma, AL, with my friend John Lewis. The two of us looked across at that piece of territory just at the bottom of the bridge where John Lewis nearly died when he was beaten during that march.

John Lewis risked his life so poor people and Black people in the Deep South could vote.

John Lewis had more moral courage than anyone I have known.

Many of our Republican friends say they revere him too. Well, today is the chance to show it. John Lewis championed the Voting Rights Advancement Act in the months before he died. He knew it would protect the America he loved and the cause he nearly died for.

The bill we will vote to begin debating later today is based on the same foundation as the Voting Rights Act extension that passed the Senate unanimously in 2006. Unanimously, it passed. But that was then, and this is now.

Do you know who voted in 2006 for the protections that we seek to restore with the John Lewis Voting Rights Advancement Act?

Senator LISA MURKOWSKI was one of those who did. But also at that time in 2006, the Senate Republican Leader, Senator MITCH MCCONNELL; the Senate Republican Whip, Senator JOHN THUNE—they voted for it too. It was a bipartisan, unanimous undertaking.

Next week, Americans will pause to honor the courage and sacrifice of our veterans. Before we vote on whether to allow the Senate to even begin debating voting rights, I urge my Republican friends to remember the words spoken by another President, President Johnson.

He spoke in the Capitol Rotunda, surrounded by Republican and Democratic Senators of the day and the Reverend Martin Luther King and other heroes of the long struggle to secure voting rights. President Johnson called the passage of the Voting Rights Act "a triumph for freedom as huge as any victory that has ever been won on any battlefield."

For all those—the thousands—who have risked their lives to defend this country, they were defending not just a name, not just a piece of geography; they were defending our rights as Americans and they were prepared to die for it, whether on the foreign battlefield or on a bridge in Selma.

I urge my Republican colleagues to let the Senate debate voting rights. Vote "yes" for cloture.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, later today, the Senate will vote on the latest power grab by our friends across the aisle, a bill that is called the John Lewis Voting Rights Advancement Act of 2021.

The most important reason to vote against this legislation is that it is clearly unconstitutional.

I know it is unusual for Members of the legislative branch to make statements like that, but we do take an oath to uphold the Constitution and laws of the United States, and I think it is part of our responsibility to assess the constitutionality of legislation that is being proposed and to make a judgment on whether it is constitutional or not.

One reason why I say that is because the Supreme Court has made very clear that it is within the authority of the States to conduct elections, and that those elections must be run subject to the Voting Rights Act; but that is section 2 of the Voting Rights Act, which applies across the entire country.

One of the reasons we find ourselves in this position today is because, in 2006, our Democratic colleagues proposed an extension of the Voting Rights Act but did not update the formula by which covered States were being determined. In other words, in 2006, they did not reflect the huge im-

provement and advances made in minority voting strength since 1965.

I think you could say without fear of contradiction that the Voting Rights Act is one of the most important and most successful pieces of legislation ever passed in this country. The good news is that it has worked exactly as Congress had hoped. So our colleagues are really trying to pass an unconstitutional law, which would require States to change their voting rules to ask permission of the Biden Justice Department before they do so.

As Chief Justice Roberts laid out in the Shelby County case, that is a departure from the norm, to be sure, and can only be justified to remedy past discrimination. But if you look at the current numbers of minority voting strength around the country, you see minorities voting at historically high numbers and even in many instances exceeding that of the majority. So this is really a piece of legislation that is being sold under false pretenses.

Based on the way our Democratic colleagues talk about the state of voting rights in America, you would think the Supreme Court had struck down the Voting Rights Act. The chairman of the Judiciary Committee, who just spoke, the Democratic whip, described the current law as an "insidious effort to suppress the right of voters of color."

The majority leader, Senator SCHUMER, recently said that the right to vote was "under attack in ways we have not seen in generations."

And the Speaker of the House has said "voting rights are under relentless attack."

But the facts do not align with this doom and gloom picture of America. In 2020, roughly two-thirds of all eligible voters cast a ballot. In Texas, 66 percent of registered voters cast a ballot, 11.3 million voters. Compared to 2016, 17 million more people voted in 2020. This includes a higher turnout in Black, White, Hispanic, and Asian-American communities.

When Congress passed the Voting Rights Act back in 1965, the goal—the laudable goal, which we all share—was to eliminate discriminatory practices, and there is no question that it ultimately has worked.

In 2012, for the first time on record, the turnout among Black voters was higher than that of White voters—higher. And in 2012, Hispanic and Asian voters turned out at the highest rate on record.

So, clearly, thankfully, we have come a long way since 1965. And despite what Democrats would have you believe, the Voting Rights Act is alive and well and continues to protect minority Americans from discrimination.

Even though the facts don't align with the Democrats' sky-is-falling depiction of voting rights in America, that hasn't stopped them from pushing this false narrative of widespread voter suppression. As our colleagues have demonstrated over the past few years,

they have one tried-and-true strategy: if you can't win the game, change the rules.

They failed to stop conservative nominees from reaching the Supreme Court, so their solution is to pack the Supreme Court with additional Justices—just add more liberal Justices. They are uninterested in bipartisanship, so they proposed ending the legislative filibuster. We have heard that time and time again. The Democratic whip just talked about the filibuster. And since they failed to secure a mandate in Congress, they want to forever change the rules of America's elections to rig the game in their favor.

We have seen a steady stream of bills designed by our Democratic colleagues to achieve this end. This current bill, I think, is about the third iteration. First came the so-called For the People Act.

Who could be against the For the People Act?

It was so unpopular among Democrats that they had to go back to the drawing board and rewrite it. When the updated version came to the floor for a Senate vote, it went down with bipartisan opposition. So they came back from their drawing board once again, giving their legislation a new and different name: the Freedom to Vote Act.

They stripped out some of the most egregious provisions, but not nearly enough to change the fate of this partisan bill; and like its predecessor, it failed to pass the Senate.

But now our Democratic colleagues, they really do have the answer: a bill that perverts the cause of voting rights to give the Democratic Party unprecedented control over America's elections.

At the heart of this legislation is the preclearance regime. In other words, the States would have to ask the Federal Government: Can we pass laws in our State?

And it would be up to the Biden Justice Department and Merrick Garland to say yes or no.

Now, back in 1965, the original Voting Rights Act did have a preclearance requirement, but it is clear that, according to the Supreme Court, that was only justified based on a history of past discrimination, which has now been essentially eradicated, if you believe the numbers of minority voters who are casting their ballots now.

So think about the children's game, "Mother, may I?" All the kids line up on one side of the room except one who stands on the other side and acts like the mother. Before anyone can move forward, they have to ask, "Mother, may I?" Sometimes the mother says "yes, you may," and sometimes she says "no, you may not." Sometimes she even orders the children to take a step backward.

That is eventually what Democrats are proposing in this legislation, to make the Biden Justice Department the mother, and the States have to ask, "Mother, may I?" before they

could even fulfill their constitutional responsibilities.

In 2013, the Supreme Court struck down the portion of the law that set the formula for when a State or local jurisdiction would have to seek preclearance. But, to be clear—and you can't tell this from the rhetoric on the left—the Court did not strike down the Voting Rights Act in its entirety; just the formula that determined which States would be covered. Because, as the Supreme Court said, that formula had to reflect current conditions, and, instead, Congress chose not to update the formula from 1965. That was section 4 of the Voting Rights Act, which the Supreme Court of the United States held unconstitutional.

Chief Justice Roberts, in his opinion, speaking of the formula in that legislation, said: "... history did not end in 1965."

Well, here's an example. The formula set in 1965 required States to receive preclearance if they had any "test or device" that restricts voting. That would include things like literacy tests or subjective determinations of good moral character, which are, thankfully, nowhere to be found today.

Democrats have tried to market this bill as a response to the Supreme Court's decision, but the truth is this legislation goes far beyond updating that outdated formula.

It would make the formula so broad that virtually every State would have to ask of the Biden Justice Department, "Mother, may I?" before making any changes in their election laws. So if a county or municipal utility district or the State itself wanted to do something as simple as clean up voter rolls and remove the names of dead people, they would have to ask the Federal Government and the Biden Justice Department for permission to do so.

Well, this is the same organization—the Biden Justice Department—that recently took aggressive actions to discourage parents from exercising their constitutional right to speak out at local school board meetings.

Clearly, we don't need to vest States' authorities in the hands of these unanswerable bureaucrats who are willing to abuse their power to discourage parents from exercising their constitutional rights.

Based on this broad formula, you would think there has been countless unenforced instances of voter discrimination. If Democrats are willing to go this far to stop discrimination, it must be a widespread problem, right?

Wrong.

The Justice Department, as I said, retains the right to enforce section 2 of the Voting Rights Act, which applies to the entire United States, and it prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color, or membership in a language minority group.

During the entire 8 years of the Obama administration, the Justice Department only filed four—four—enforcement cases under section 2.

Well, if you think that discrimination against minority voters is rampant, don't you think you would see more than four enforcement actions by the Obama administration over an 8-year period of time?

Well, the power grab doesn't stop there.

This legislation also gives the Department of Justice veto power over State voter ID laws. Now, we all know you have to show a photo ID to open up a bank account; buy tobacco, alcohol; get married; board a plane; and do countless other things in our country. But our Democratic colleagues have this thing about requiring voter ID to vote, to make sure that you are actually qualified and authorized to cast a ballot.

The American people overwhelmingly support voter ID laws. Four in five people believe voters should be required to show a voter ID in order to cast a ballot. But this legislation would override the will of 80 percent of Americans and allow the Justice Department to veto those laws for basically any reason that they choose.

In so many ways, this legislation is a solution in search of a problem. It interferes—and I would say it usurps—the States' constitutional authority to manage their own elections and set their own congressional districts.

You would have to ask "Mother, may I?" of the Biden Justice Department to redo any redistricting, which is currently underway now, in advance.

And it makes it virtually impossible for the States to take actions to prevent fraud, essentially encouraging them to wait for large-scale voter fraud before they can take any action. And it arms the Department of Justice with new powers that will surely be used against those of the Democratic Party.

We are still seeing the consequences of the Justice Department's blatant attack on concerned parents in our schools. Why on Earth would we hand a politically motivated Department even more power to abuse, especially when that power could shape the result of our elections?

From city councils and school boards, all the way up to the President of the United States, the American people have a right—and I would argue a duty—to make their voices heard. A "government of the people, by the people, for the people"—as Abraham Lincoln phrased it—is only possible if all Americans are free to participate in public life.

Despite what the radical left might lead you to believe, there is no nationwide assault on minority voting rights. If there were, every single person in this building would be lined up together, arm's length, to fight against it.

As I said before, the Voting Rights Act of 1965 is one of the most important laws in modern American history, and it has actually worked, and it continues to protect all persons of color from any sort of discrimination when

it comes to their right to cast their ballot.

This bill isn't about supporting disenfranchised voters, though, or fighting voter suppression. This is a politically motivated power grab that would allow Democrats to determine and Washington to determine how elections in Texas would run.

The narrative of widespread voter suppression is nothing but a scare tactic designed to support a political outcome.

Republicans have blocked every iteration of this partisan power grab so far, and we will stand together to oppose this one as well at the next vote.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ELECTION RESULTS

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, last night, the American people sent an unmistakable message to the Democratic Party: We don't like your agenda, we don't want your agenda, and we won't vote for your agenda or for you.

During this election, the Democratic Party was exposed for what it has become: a party that holds police, parents, and patriotism in contempt. And now the Democrats have paid the price. The Democrats will continue to pay that price until they reject the repugnant radicalism that has infected their party.

The Democratic defeat last night was not in a single State or one county or some isolated municipality. It was not some isolated incident. It was not the result of just a single quirky issue or a bad candidate. It was a nationwide disaster and wipeout for the Democratic Party.

After 12 years of uninterrupted statewide victories in the Commonwealth of Virginia, Democrats appear to have lost not one, not two, but all three statewide races this year, along with control of the Virginia House of Delegates. And the only reason they didn't lose the Virginia State Senate is the State senate wasn't on the ballot last night.

I would remind you that Virginia is not a swing State, as you may have heard this morning to excuse the Democrats' terrible performance. Joe Biden won Virginia by 10 points. It has been 12 years since Virginia voted for a Republican. Virginia is a Democratic State and has been for more than a decade. Yet, now, Joe Biden's acolytes have been soundly defeated by Republican Governor-elect Glenn Youngkin, Lieutenant Governor-elect Winsome Sears, and Attorney General-elect Jason Miyares. It is remarkable how quickly the President's party has frittered away all of the good will in Virginia.

Now, I have also heard some Democrats try to explain away the loss in Virginia by saying Terry McAuliffe was a bad candidate. Now, I certainly have no grief for Terry McAuliffe, but I would say that Terry McAuliffe was such a bad candidate that he also is causing the Democratic Governor in New Jersey to lose. Joe Biden won that State by 16 points, and at this moment, the Governor's race is too close to call—too close to call. So it is at least a 16-point swing even if the Democratic Governor squeaks it out.

Oh, by the way, the Democratic State senate president, one of the key power brokers in New Jersey, appears to be on his path to losing to a Republican truckdriver who spent a grand total of \$153 on his campaign but someone who said: I am a dad and I am a grandfather, and I think that we are taxed too much and that we need better representation.

If anyone had told Governor Phil Murphy and the Democrats yesterday that this would be a close race, he would have been laughed out of the room. Yet outrage against Democratic policies is rampant even in deep blue New Jersey.

Looking across State lines in New York, there was a similarly shocking outcome, with Republicans apparently sweeping every office in Long Island—every office in Long Island—driven in no small part by the insane, pro-criminal policies of the New York Democrats who want to eliminate cash bail and defund the police and go soft on criminals and let them out of jail early.

Speaking of that, let's turn to deep, deep blue Minneapolis, MN, where the BLM riots got kicked off last summer, where Democratic "defund the police" radicals have waged an unrelenting war on their city's police force. In a referendum to replace the police department, 56 percent of voters revolted and voted to keep the police department just the way it is—thank you very much.

This should teach the Democrats an important lesson. If "defund the police" can't win in a city that has been run entirely by Democratic mayors for nearly a half-century, it is not going to win anywhere.

Now, if this was a bad night for Democrats, it was an even worse night for the woke, far-left progressives who dominate in the Democratic Party. In Buffalo, NY, voters appear to have rejected this Democratic radicalism. Self-proclaimed socialist mayoral candidate India Walton had actually beaten the incumbent Democratic mayor earlier this year for the nomination, but now India Walton is losing to the current mayor in a write-in campaign—a write-in campaign.

Again, if your far-left policies can't even win when you are your party's nominee and in a city that has been run entirely by Democrats for a half-century, you had better believe they are bad and unpopular policies that will cost you your next election.

Finally, as far away as San Antonio, Republicans have flipped a largely Hispanic district long considered a Democratic bastion in a clear sign that Republican inroads with Hispanic voters last year were not a fluke.

So what is responsible for this astounding red wave unlike anything we have seen in years? Well, if you listen to some in the media this morning, the answer is the same as always: It is Republican racism. Glenn Youngkin is apparently a smiling, fleece-jacket wearing reincarnation of Democratic demagogues. But if you look at the map and you look at the actual results, this laughable attack is exposed for what it is: dishonest propaganda.

As part of this supposedly racist or White supremacist backlash election, more than half of Hispanic voters appear to have pulled the lever for Glenn Youngkin. Not one but two plurality-Black Virginia State House districts flipped to the GOP. Best of all for this supposedly racist or White supremacist backlash election, Virginia voters just elected the State's first Black female Lieutenant Governor. That woman is Winsome Sears, a gun-toting immigrant, Marine veteran, and a proud conservative Republican.

So much for the media spin. Now for the truth. According to exit polls, the top issues on voters' minds were the economy and education. Both spelled disaster for the Democrats.

For months, Americans have watched with alarm as Democrats have shoveled trillions of dollars into liberal priorities while inflation has surged upwards. They have suffered skyrocketing costs at the grocery store and the gas pump.

First, the Democrats said this is merely transitory inflation. Then they laughed it off as a joke, and they said: Sorry. You will have to lower your expectations. It may take you a while to get your treadmill.

Then they demanded trillions of dollars more in their so-called Build Back Better initiative, which should perhaps be called "build back broke" if you are a working family.

So when Glenn Youngkin offered to eliminate Virginia's onerous grocery tax and cut the progressive gas tax, normal Virginians listened, and they voted.

American parents have also been ignored and mistreated by the schools that are supposed to be teaching their kids. Remote learning was a disaster for America's children. Some have fallen months behind in their development, and many more have suffered the consequences of social isolation. But if there is a silver lining in this tragedy, it is that parents were finally able to see the nonsense that their kids were being taught: critical race theory, indoctrinated to see everything and everyone first and foremost by the color of their skin and to hate their country. Parents were outraged, and parents were right to be outraged.

Now, the Democrats' response to this controversy reminds me of the old line